

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the typographical error in claim 21 has been corrected by the above amendment. Entry of the above amendment is believed therefore appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The continued rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 11, 12 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by Ramjee '462 is respectfully traversed. The continued rejection of other claims as allegedly being made "obvious" based on Ramjee in view of Bruno '765 or in view of Rauhala '547 are also respectfully traversed. Because applicant continues to believe that there are fundamental deficiencies in the primary Ramjee reference used in all grounds of rejection, comments are focused upon this single reference. That is, it is not believed necessary at this time to detail the additional deficiencies of the secondary references and/or the allegedly "obvious" combination of selected features from these references in other contexts.

The Examiner's reasoning is difficult to follow as the references relied on to support the argument that claim 1 (amongst others) is anticipated by Ramjee (see paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Action) are not the same as those referred to in paragraph 8 where applicant's previous arguments for patentability are dismissed.

The cited passages in Ramjee discuss conventional Mobile IP and the Examiner appears to be using undue hindsight to "cherry pick" features that are then argued to provide the claimed feature--while ignoring those aspects of the claim and/or Ramjee which do not fit in with this improper preconceived template "analysis".

For example, Ramjee does not disclose that:

“subsequent to the designation of said interface, handling over the communications link of the mobile node, such that the second access node serves said mobile node”

That is, Ramjee does not disclose that the tunnel is made prior to the hand-over of the mobile node.

Neither is there any disclosure in Ramjee that:

“responsive to the handing over of the communications link, altering routing in said infrastructure for said first network address to create a second routing path for said first network address, directed to said second access node;”

Thus, it is abundantly clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ramjee.

Ramjee's possibly relevant disclosure appears at 6:49-9:60 with reference to Figures 4 and 5. Ramjee discloses an interworking of GPRS and IP such that the Base Station Controllers (BSCs) and Base Terminal Stations (BTSS) can be accessed using GPRS: a GPRS-IP Interworking (GII) entity connects these elements to the IP-based intermediate routers (IRs) and domain routers (DRs).

Ramjee's discussion of handovers in such a network is limited to that provided at 8:38-9:12. It is immediately and unambiguously apparent to a skilled person in the art that Ramjee handovers are performed only in accordance with even then known conventional techniques such as Mobile IP (MIP) and HAWAII.

There is nothing in Ramjee, whether in the disclosure of Ramjee or in its discussion of prior art that either discloses applicant's invention, or would lead the skilled person to the claimed subject matter.

O'NEILL et al
Appl. No. 10/018,485
July 30, 2007

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition and a formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Larry S. Nixon/
Larry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100